

Gdzie ‘where’ as a concessive complementizer. Evidence from Polish subordinate clauses

Łukasz Jędrzejowski (University of Cologne) & Wojciech Guz (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin)

Introduction In this talk, we examine the syntax and the semantics of subordinate clauses headed by the *wh*-word *gdzie* ‘where’ in Polish. We argue that i) *gdzie* is base-generated as a concessive head in ActP (Speech Act Phrase), and that no movement from a lower position is involved, ii) concessive *gdzie*-clauses ought to be analyzed as disintegrated adverbial clauses adjoining outside the matrix clause structure, and iii) although concessive *gdzie*-clauses exhibit properties of subordinate clauses, they are syntactically not embedded and possess their own illocutionary force.

Phenomenon Cross-linguistically, it is well-known that the *wh*-word *where* can introduce embedded *wh*-interrogative clauses (Karttunen 1977), free *wh*-relatives (Caponigro 2003) and modal existential *wh*-constructions (Šimík 2011). Polish is not different in this respect:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(1) Zapytaj go, gdzie mieszka.
ask.2SG.IMPER him.ACC where live.3SG
‘Ask him where he lives.’</p> | <p>embedded <i>wh</i>-interrogative clause</p> |
| <p>(2) Będę spać, gdzie Ania śpi.
will.1SG sleep.INFV where Ania sleep.3SG
‘I’ll sleep where Ania sleeps.’</p> | <p>free <i>wh</i>-relative clause</p> |
| <p>(3) Mam gdzie spać.
have.1SG where sleep.INFV
‘I have a place where I can sleep.’</p> | <p>modal existential <i>wh</i>-construction</p> |

Interestingly enough, in colloquial Polish *gdzie* can additionally introduce concessive subordinate clauses:

- (4) Wybrały mi czarne spodnie, gdzie ja nie noszę czarnego.
choose.1-PTCP.N-VIR me.DAT black pants where I NEG wear.1SG black.GEN
‘They bought me black pants, although I don’t wear black.’ (the Spokes corpus (Pęzik 2015); text ID: 4IWE)

In (4), *gdzie* introduces a concessive relation – *p*, *gdzie q* – involving two components. Its at-issue meaning expresses that *p* and *q* are true; its non-at-issue meaning, in turn, normally presupposes $q' \rightarrow \neg p'$, whereby *p'* and *q'* are plausible generalizations of *p* and *q*, respectively. Applying these components to (4), the speaker asserts that black pants were bought (= *p*) and that (s)he normally does not wear black clothes (= *q*). At the same time, *gdzie* presupposes that if the speaker wears clothes, they are usually not black, which can be neither questioned nor canceled due to the presuppositional nature of *gdzie*. Derivationally, (4) deviates from (1)–(3). The subordinate *where*-clause in (4) cannot be considered as an embedded *wh*-interrogative clause because it is not selected by any interrogative clause-embedding predicate; nor can it be analyzed as a free locative *wh*-relative clause because *gdzie*, as we show below, does not move from a lower position triggering λ -abstraction and giving rise to a type shift from sets of predicates to a predicate of locata, i.e. to an ordinary locative modifier (Bücking 2020, Caponigro & Pearl 2009). Finally, a modal existential *wh*-construction analysis must be ruled out too, as (4) lacks an existential clause-embedding verb and an infinitive in the subordinate clause. In what follows, we argue that *gdzie* in (4) is base-generated as an Act-head.

Analysis We assume *gdzie* in concessive subordinate clauses to be an Act-head, (5a), involving no movement from a lower position, (5b) (a similar proposal has been made by Citko 2000 with regard to the *wh*-word *jak* ‘how’ heading, as a C-head, conditional clauses in Polish):

- (5) a. [_{ActP} [_{Act}⁰ *gdzie*] [_{ActP} ...]] b. * [_{ActP} [_{Spec,Act/Act}⁰ *gdzie*_i] [_{VP} ... _{t_i]]]}

One of the arguments supporting the head status of *gdzie* is that it blocks extraction:¹

- (6) *Będzie tam człowiek, [CP₂ którego_i] [CP₂ gdzie ja nienawidę <sub>t_i]] ludzie uwielbiają.
will.3SG there man which where I hate.1SG people adore.3PL
Intended: ‘There will be a man whom people adore, although I hate him.’</sub>

We also claim that concessive subordinate *gdzie*-clauses in Polish should be analyzed as disintegrated adverbial clauses throughout (Haegeman 2003, 2012, Frey 2016, 2020). They prohibit movement to the left periphery of the matrix clause, (7), disallow variable binding, (8), and cannot form a single constituent with a complement *that*-clause, (9):

- (7) *[Gdzie ja nie noszę czarnego]_i wybrały mi czarne spodnie _{t_i}
where I NEG wear.1SG black.GEN choose.1-PTCP.PL.N-VIR me.DAT black pants
- (8) *[Każdy pacjent]_i narzeka na tego lekarza,
every patient complain.3SG on this doctor.ACC

¹ Remarkably, if we replace *gdzie* ‘where’ with the inherent concessive complementizer *choć* ‘although’, (6) becomes grammatical, although it is still a clausal adjunct creating a potential island environment. See Biskup & Šimík (2018) for how to account for such data.

gdzie on przychodzi do niego_i z wizytą codziennie.
 where he come.3SG to him.GEN with visit.INS daily

Intended: ‘Every patient complains about this doctor, although he visits him every day.’

- (9) *Dyrektor myśli, [_{CP} że nauczyciele będą strajkować, [_{CP} gdzie dostali podwyżki]].
 director think.3SG that teachers will.3PL strike.INFV where received pay:raises

Intended: ‘The director thinks that teachers will strike, although they got a pay raise.’

Based on (7)–(9), we take concessive *gdzie*-clauses to be disintegrated adverbial clauses having their own illocutionary force. Since they are not part of the matrix clause structure, it straightforwardly follows that concessive *gdzie*-clauses cannot move to a higher functional projection in the left periphery of the matrix clause, (7). The ungrammaticality of (8) is attributed to variable binding principles: a quantifier can bind an agreeing pronoun in the subordinate clause iff the quantifier c-commands the pronoun (Chomsky 1981, Enç 1989, Büring 2006). When the subordinate *gdzie*-clause adjoins outside the matrix clause structure, it is obvious that the pronoun *niego* ‘him’ cannot be c-commanded by the quantifier *każdy* ‘every’. In other words, the concessive *gdzie*-clause must adjoin above the TP layer. This also accounts for the ungrammaticality of (9), where the *gdzie*-clause is taken to be part of the internal CP-argument of the verb *myśleć* ‘think’. Since concessive *gdzie*-clauses are considered non-integrated, they are expected to be syntactically unembeddable. These findings suggest that concessive *gdzie*-clauses attach outside the matrix clause structure. We argue that they are ActPs and adjoin at the ActP level of the matrix clause. In the approach developed by Krifka (to appear), a speech act contains four distinct layers: propositions, judgements, commitments, and speech acts associated with four distinct projections, respectively: Tense Phrase (TP), Judge Phrase (JP), Commitment Phrase (ComP), and ActPhrase (ActP). Krifka (to appear) assumes assertions to be linguistic objects requiring a formal representation in the syntax. The presence of the last three projections can be backed up by the occurrence of appropriate modifiers. For Polish, some of them are listed in (10):

- (10) a. JP modifiers: *chyba* ‘presumably’, *prawdopodobnie* ‘probably’, *z pewnością* ‘certainly’, *rzekomo* ‘allegedly’;
 b. ComP modifiers: *naprawdę* ‘really’, *doprawdy* ‘truly’, *bez przesady* ‘without exaggeration’;
 c. ActP modifiers: *jednak* ‘however’, *szczerzy powiedziawszy* ‘to be honest’, *innymi słowy* ‘in other words’.

Concessive *gdzie*-clauses as ActPs can host all types of modifiers, containing a JP, a ComP, and an ActP:²

- (11) Wczoraj kupili mi nowe auto, gdzie ja
 yesterday buy.1-PTCP.VIR me.DAT new car where I
 szczerze powiedziawszy naprawdę chyba nie lubię jeździć samochodem.
 honestly saying really presumably NEG like.1SG go.INFV car.INS

‘Yesterday, they bought me a new car, although – to be honest – I really presumably don’t like driving.’

- (12) [_{ActP} [_{Act}⁰ *gdzie*] [_{ActP} *ja* [_{Act} *szczerze powiedziawszy*] [_{ComP} [_{Com} *naprawdę*] [_{JP} [_J *chyba*] [_{TP} ...]]]]]]]]]]

Different predictions follow from the analysis. Firstly, if concessive *gdzie*-clauses are ActPs that cannot be embedded, they are expected to disallow coordination. This prediction is indeed borne out:

- (13) *Rodzice kupili Adamowi czarny samochód, gdzie on nie lubi jeździć
 parents buy.1-PTCP.VIR Adam.DAT black car where he NEG like.3SG go.INFV
 samochodem i gdzie on nienawidzi czarnego koloru.
 car.INS and where he hate.3SG black color.GEN

Intended: ‘His parents bought Adam a black car, although he doesn’t like driving and although he hates black color.’

Coordinating elements, *i* ‘and’ in (13), are often analyzed as heads, with the right conjunct as sister and the left conjunct as specifier (Progovac 2003). Accordingly, the conjuncts are embedded, and the ungrammaticality of (13) comes from the non-integrated status of *gdzie*-clauses. Secondly, by virtue of being ActPs, *gdzie*-clauses possess their own illocutionary force and are therefore able to combine with matrix clauses having a distinct illocutionary force. This prediction can be confirmed as well:

- (14) Dlaczego sprzedałeś nowe auto? Gdzie kupiłeś je miesiąc temu.
 why sell.1-PTCP.M.2SG new car where buy.1-PTCP.M.2SG it.ACC month ago
 ‘Why did you sell the new car? Although you had bought it one month ago.’

Conclusion Cross-linguistically, it is not surprising that the *wh*-word *where* grammaticalizes into a complementizer, i.e. into a head. In German, *wo* can head causal clauses (Taigel 2020), in English pseudo-locative *where*-relatives, as Brook & Moulton (2020) convincingly show, *where* is analyzed as a C-head involving relativization over a frame-setting adverbial, which restricts a topic situation. As it turns out, Polish subordinate *gdzie*-clauses uncover another non-canonical use of *where*-words.

² Importantly, concessive clauses – similar to causal clauses – can be interpreted as content, epistemic and speech act adverbial clauses (Sweester 1990, Iten 2005). Concessive *gdzie*-clauses can operate on these three levels too. However, for the sake of convenience, we focus in this talk on the content level because content adverbial clauses are usually taken to be embedded, i.e. syntactically integrated in their host clause. Concessive *gdzie*-clauses, in turn, are disintegrated throughout, regardless of how they are interpreted.

Abbreviations

1/2/3 – 1st/2nd/3rd person, ACC – accusative, DAT – dative, GEN – genitive, IMPER – imperative mood, INFV – infinitive, INS – instrumental, *l*-PTCP – *l*-participle (inflected for number and gender), LOC – locative, N-VIR – non-virile, NEG – negation, PL – plural, SG – singular, VIR – virile.

References

- Biskup, Petr & Radek Šimík. 2018. Extraction from clausal adjuncts in Czech. Handout and talk delivered at the conference ‘Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 27’ at the Stanford University.
- Brook, Marisa & Keir Moulton. 2020. Pseudo-locative *where*-relatives. Talk and handout delivered at the ‘Workshop on Non-interrogative Subordinate *Wh*-clauses’, University of Cologne, February 7–8.
- Bücking, Sebastian. 2020. The grammar of PP-like free relatives: Evidence from subordinate *wo*-clauses in German. Manuscript, University of Tübingen.
- Büring, Daniel. 2005. *Binding Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caponigro, Ivano. 2003. Free Not to Ask: On the Semantics of Free Relatives and *Wh*-words Cross-linguistically. PhD thesis, University of California.
- Caponigro, Ivano & Lisa Pearl. 2009. The nominal nature of *where*, *when*, and *how*: Evidence from free relatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(1): 155–164.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding. The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Citko, Barbara. 2000. On the syntax and semantics of Polish adjunct clauses. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8(1–2): 5–27.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1989. Pronouns, licensing, and binding. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7(1): 51–92.
- Frey, Werner. 2016. About some correlations between formal and interpretative properties of causal clauses. In: *Co- and Subordination in German and Other Languages* ed. by Ingo Reich & Augustin Speyer, 153–179. Hamburg: Buske.
- Frey, Werner. 2020. German concessives as TPs, JPs, and ActPs. *Glossa: A Journal General Linguistics* 5(110): 1–31.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. Conditional clauses: External and internal syntax. *Mind and Language* 18(4): 317–339.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and the Composition of the Left Periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iten, Corinne. 2005. *Linguistic Meaning, Truth Conditions and Relevance. The Case of Concessives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1977. Syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1(1): 3–44.
- Krifka, Manfred. to appear. Layers of assertive clauses: Propositions, judgements, commitments, acts. In: *Propositionale Argumente im Sprachvergleich: Theorie und Empirie / Propositional Arguments in Cross-Linguistic Research: Theoretical and Empirical Issues* ed. by Jutta Hartmann & Angelika Wöllstein. Tübingen: Narr.
- Peżik, Piotr. 2015. Spokes – a search and exploration service for conversational corpus data. In: *Selected Papers from the CLARIN 2014 Conference* ed. by Jan Odijk, 99–109. Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press [Spokes available on-line at <http://spokes.clarin-pl.eu>; accessed December 15, 2020].
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 2003. Structure for coordination. In: *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book. The Latest in Linguistics* ed. by Lisa Cheng & Rint Sybesma, 241–288. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Šimík, Radek. 2011. Modal Existential *Wh*-Constructions. PhD thesis, University of Groningen.
- Taigel, Sonja. 2020. On the role of the left periphery in the interpretation of causal *wo*-verbend clauses. In: *Verb Second – Grammar Internal and Grammar External Interfaces* [Interface Explorations 34] ed. by Horst Lohnstein & Antonios Tsiknakis, 329–370. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.